

REMARKS

With entry of this amendment, claims 1-22 and 33-60 are pending in this application, all of which stand rejected. Based on the foregoing amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

Claim Amendments

Applicant emphasizes that the amendments made to the claims have been either made to correct typographical errors or to make the claims more readable. No claim amendments have been made to overcome any current or anticipated rejection based on prior art or otherwise.

Correction of Inventorship-37 C.F.R. §1.48(b)

Claims 23-32, which recite the only subject matter that Mr. Jwahar Raju Bammi contributed to, have been cancelled from this application. Because Mr. Bammi has not contributed to any subject matter that is currently being claimed, it is respectfully requested that Mr. Bammi be deleted as a named inventor from this patent application, and that a correct filing receipt reflecting the corrected inventorship be issued.

Claim Objections

Claim 29 stands objected to because the term “assembler” is misspelled “assember”. Claim 29 has been cancelled from this application, thereby rendering this objection moot.

Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-13, 16-19, 21-22, 33-45, 47-51, and 53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), as being anticipated by “A Compilation-based Software Estimation Scheme for

Hardware/Software Co-Simulation,” 7<sup>th</sup> International Workshop on Hardware/Software Co-Design, May 3-5 (1999), authored by Marcello Lajolo, Mihai Lazarescu, and Alberto Sangiovanni-Vincentelli (the “Lajolo publication”).

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, since the Lajolo publication is not a §102(b) prior art reference. In particular, the present application claims priority from U.S. Patent Application 60/201,540, filed May 2, 2000, less than one year before the May 3, 1999 publication date of the Lajolo publication.

To the extent that the Examiner is inclined to use the Lajolo publication as a §102(a) prior art reference, the disclosure of the Lajolo publication was derived from the corrected inventorship entity of Luciano Lavagno, Mihai Lazarescu, Alberto Sangiovanni-Vincentelli, and Marcello Lajolo, as evidenced by the Rule 132 Declaration of Luciano Lavagno, Mihai Lazarescu, Alberto Sangiovanni-Vincentelli, and Marcello Lajolo, attached hereto. As such, although the Lajolo publication discloses the claimed subject matter, it was not disclosed or published by another, and thus, does not constitute a §102(a) prior art reference.

Thus, Applicant submits that the Lajolo publication has been effectively removed as §102(a) prior art, and as such, respectfully requests withdrawal of the §102 rejections of claims 1-13, 16-19, 21-22, 33-45, 47-51, and 53.

Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 14, 20, 23-32, 46, 52, and 54-60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103, as being obvious over various combinations of the Lajolo publication, “Writing Compilers and Interpreters: an Applied Approach,” John Wiley & Sons (1991) (the “Mak Publication”),

“Generation of Software Tools from Processor Descriptions for Hardware/Software Codesign,” Proceedings of the 34<sup>th</sup> Design Automation Conference, June 9-13 (1997), authored by Mark R. Hartoog, James A. Rowson, Prakash D. Reddy, Douglas D. Dunlop, Edwin A. Harcourt, and Neeti Khullar (the “Hartoog Publication”), and “Efficient Software Performance Estimation Methods for Hardware/Software Codesign,” Proceedings of the 33<sup>rd</sup> Annual Conference on Design Automation (1996), authored by Kei Suzuki and Alberto Sangiovanni-Vincentelli (the “Suzuki publication”).

Claims 23-32 have been cancelled, thereby rendering the rejections of these claims moot. As for the remaining claims, Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections, since the Lajolo publication is not a prior art reference, and the Mak publication, Hartoog publication, and Suzuki publication do not replace the teachings of the Lajolo publication.

Thus, Applicant believes that claims 14, 20, 46, 52, and 54-60 are not obvious over the prior art of record, and as such, respectfully request withdrawal of the §103 rejections of these claims.

### Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, it is believed that all claims are now allowable and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments

PATENT  
2019535-7012162001  
(261/246)

regarding this amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at (714) 830-0600.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Bolan  
Reg. No. 42,339

Dated: November 2, 2005

Bingham McCutchen LLP  
Three Embarcadero Center, 18th Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111